DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 196 AC 003 959

By-Giuliani, Betty

Summary of Questionnaire Survey.

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C. Council on Extension.
Pub Date 67
Note-30p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60
Descriptors-Educational Coordination, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Land Grant Universities, *Private Colleges, Questionnaires, Role Conflict, *State Universities, Statistical Data, *University Extension

The Committee on Relationships with Other Educational Institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASU-LGC) Council on Extension, undertook to assign 49 states to one of six categories which reflected the degree of coordination present among the institutions. The categories were delineated as follows: (1) a formal organization for coordination of extension work exists and is functioning; (2) some formal coordination exists among institutions in the state which offer extension course work; (3) one institution in the state offers the great majority of extension course work and no coordination among institutions is necessary; (4) several institutions within the state are engaged in extension course work, but these institutions feel no need for interinstitutional cooperation; (5) several institutions within the state offer extension courses and believe there is a need for coordination, but there is no formal or informal organization in existence; (6) reports were received from more than one institution in the state and the information is conflicting or contradictory. Data which were collected through mailed questionnaires revealed the following: 13 states fall in category 1, 7 in 2, 2 in 5, and 2 in 6. (The questionnaire is included). (nl)

ED027670

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Summary of Questionnaire Survey

conducted by

The Committee on Relationships with
Other Educational Institutions

of the

NASU-LGC Council on Extension

Committee Members:

J. E. Arnold
J. C. Fitzgerald
Ben G. Gustafson
Maurice N. Inman
Hugh L. Mills
Nicholas P. Mitchell
John A. Murray
William M. Stephens
Armand L. Hunter, Chairman

Study Design and Report
--by Betty Giuliani

AC003959

On June 27, 1967, a three-page questionnaire was mailed to Deans and Directors of Extension whose institutions are members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges' Council on Extension. (See Appendix A for questionnaire and Appendix B for the mailing list.)

Seventy-three Deans and Directors representing institutions in 49 states were contacted. Forty-one returns were received from 34 different states. Of the 21 states having two or more members in NASU-LGC, six returned two or more questionnaires. (Table I)

Table I

Return of Questionnaire

	N	%
Questionnaires sent	73	100
Questionnaires returned	41	56
Number of states represented on mailing list	49	100
Number of states represented in sample	34	69
Number of states sent two or more questionnaires	21	100
Number of states returning two or more questionnaires	6	29

Respondents were first asked to indicate the number of public and private institutions of higher education in their states which offered credit and/or non-credit extension course work and second, whether or not there existed some organization within the state for coordinating extension offerings. For the purposes of this report, organizations were designated Formal, Informal, or Nonexistent (F, I, or N in Table III, Column 5). After reviewing the data, states were assigned to one of six categories which further specified the status of coordination activities

within a state (1 through 6 in Table III, Column 6). The six categories are defined as follows.

Categories for Extension Coordination

Category 1 A formal organization for coordination of extension work exists and is functioning.

Category 2 Some informal coordination exists among institutions of the state which offer extension course work.

Category 3 One institution in the state offers the great majority of extension course work and no coordination among institutions is necessary.

Category 4 Several institutions within the state are engaged in extension course work, but these institutions feel no need for inter-institutional cooperation.

Category 5 Several institutions within the state offer extension course work, believe there is a need for coordination, but there is no formal or informal organization in existence.

Category 6 Reports were received from more than one institution in the state and the information is conflicting or contradictory.

Two reports were received from each of three states (Indiana, North Carolina, and Virginia) which, although agreeing that a formal organization does exist, disagree on other particulars. These three states were categorized 1-6 in Table III, Column 6. A summary of the distribution of states by category is presented in Table II.

Table II

Distribution of States by Category

Category	N	%
1	10	29
2	7	21
3	5	15
4	5	15
5	2	6
6	2	6
1-6	3	9
Totals	34	101[a]

a = Percent total over 100 due to rounding

Shown in Table III is the total number of institutions within a state offering extension course work (Column 1), and in Columns 2, 3, and 4

Table III

Number of Institutions of Higher Education
Offering Extension Course Work and Status of Organization

State	1 Total	2 State Supp.	3 Private Supp.	4 Other Public Supp.	5 Status of Organization	6 Category for Coor.
Alaska	3	1	2	0	N	3
Arizona[a]	(5	5	0	0	N)	6
	(9	3	6	0	I)	
Delaware	4	3	1	0	N	4
Florida	56	7	24	25	F	1
Idaho	2	2	0	0	F	1
Illinois	24	8	13	3	F	1
Indiana[a]	(6	4	2	0	F)	1-6
	(4	4	0	0	F)	
Iowa	6	3	3	0	F	1
Kansas	6	5	0	1	F	1
Louisiana	3	3	0	0	I	2
Maine	3	2	1	0	N	3
Maryland	6	4	2	0	N	5
Michigan[a]	(48	10	18	27	F)	1
	(none given - - - - - - - - - - -				F)	
Minnesota	19	15	4	0	N	5
Mississippi	9	7	2	0	I	2
Missouri	19	7	12	0	N	4
Nebraska	6	3	2	1	I	2
Nevada	1	1	0	0	N	3
New Hampshire	6	3	3	0	N	4
New Jersey	23	13	10	0	I	2
New Mexico	5	5	0	0	N	4
North Carolina[a]	(70	15	43	12	F)	1-6
	(8	8	0	0	F)	
North Dakota	13	9	2	2	F	1
Ohio[a]	(19	11	8	0	F)	6
	(51	8	41	2	N)	
	(?	10	?	?	N)	
Oklahoma	35	18	12	5	F	1
Pennsylvania	20	5	12	3	I	2
South Carolina	3	3	0	0	I	2
Tennessee	10	6	3	1	I	2
Texas	not known - - - - - - - - - - -				N	3
Utah	4	3	1	0	F	1
Virginia[a]	(not known	5	?	?	F)	1-6
	(42	23	17	2	F)	
Washington	29	26	3	0	F	1
West Virginia	10	6	4	0	N	4
Wyoming	1	1	0	0	N	3

a = More than one report received and each is listed separately.

respectively, the number of state-supported institutions, privately supported institutions, and other publicly supported (i.e., municipal, county) institutions making up the total. Columns 5 and 6 contain information on the status of coordinating organizations within the state as described above.

Category 1: The Formal Organizations

Thirteen states report the existence of formal organizations for the coordination of extension course work. A summary of data for this group is presented in Table IV. The membership of a majority of the organizations

Table IV

Make-Up of Organization Membership - By State - Category 1

N = 13

State	Total Memb.	Type of Institution & Type of Support				Frequency of Meetings
		Two Year	Four Year	Public	Private	
Florida	7	2	5	7(32)[a]	0(24)[a]	Monthly
Idaho	2	0	2	2(2)	0(0)	Permanent Staff
Illinois	8	0	8	8(11)	0(13)	Quarterly
Indiana	4	0	4	4(4)	0(2)	Monthly
Iowa	3	0	3	3(3)	0(3)	Monthly
Kansas	50	(Kansas Assoc. of Colleges & Universities)				Yearly
Michigan	11	0	11	11(30)	0(18)	4-10 times yearly
North Carolina	9	0	9	9(27)	0(43)	Quarterly
North Dakota	13	5	8	10(11)	3(2)	Monthly
Oklahoma	26	10 (Three 2-yr. inst. unclassified)	16	18(23)	5(12)	Monthly
Utah	4	0	4	3(3)	1(1)	Monthly
Virginia	14	1	13	14(25)	0(17)	5-8 times yearly
Washington	5	0	5	5(26)	0(3)	On call

a = Number of institutions of each type offering extension work in the state.

(8 of 13) is composed of four-year, state-supported institutions. Idaho, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and Utah, however, appear to have fairly comprehensive representation from those institutions within the state which offer extension work.

What do the organizations do? Of the seven coordination activities listed in the questionnaire, six were carried on by at least 8 of the 13 organizations. (Table V) Six states listed additional organization services or projects in operation at the present time and seven states mentioned new activities which are now in the planning stage. (See Tables VI and VII) Seven of the organizations appear to be quite active as coordinating bodies; Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, North Dakota, and Virginia indicated that their organizations were currently responsible for at least seven separate kinds of cooperative coordinating services.

Table V

Activities Conducted by Formal Organizations

N = 13 states

Activities	N
a. Collect and disseminate information relative to extension offerings	10
b. Operate joint extension centers	8
c. Coordinate course offerings to avoid duplication	11
d. Cooperate to provide comprehensive course offerings throughout state	9
e. Accept for equivalent credit, courses taught by faculty from member institutions	8
f. Maintain a file on qualified extension lecturers from which member institutions can draw	3
g. Work with other educational institutions and agencies to develop, coordinate, and strengthen extension programs	11

Table VI

Additional Activities Now in Operation

Florida	None
Idaho	None
Illinois	1) Cooperative research on extension students 2) Joint annual report to Council of Presidents 3) Publish joint brochure describing extension activities in state-supported institutions
Indiana	1) Cooperative program for teacher education
Iowa	1) State agency for Title I programs and state technical services programs 2) Exchange of radio programs 3) Jointly list correspondence courses
Kansas	None
Michigan	1) Resource organization for State Department of Education in development of state-wide programs 2) Administers Title I 3) Share enrollment data
North Carolina	None
North Dakota	1) Advisory organization to Higher Education Act Agency (Title I)
Oklahoma	None
Utah	None
Virginia	1) Jointly publish data on extension offerings each year
Washington	None

Table VII

Activities Planned for Future Initiation

Florida	1) Invite private universities to be represented on Council
Idaho	None
Illinois	1) Add non-credit programs 2) Improve coordination with community colleges and private institutions 3) Re-evaluate organization objectives and study needs for new competencies
Indiana	1) Consider master plans study
Iowa	None
Kansas	None
Michigan	1) Establishment of the "Michigan Institute of Continuing Higher Education"--a proposed organization with representation from public and private, 2-year and 4-year institutions headed by a permanent Director and supporting staff 2) Cooperative effort to investigate a common degree to be earned in extension
North Carolina	1) Cooperative planning with State Board of Higher Education
North Dakota	None
Oklahoma	None
Utah	None
Virginia	1) Coordination of public service activities of state-controlled institutions
Washington	1) Studying need for coordination of correspondence study offerings

Organization structures differ somewhat from state to state. The Florida and Idaho operations are permanently staffed with directors and supporting services and personnel. The Florida Office for Continuing Education is under the Florida Board of Regents and the Idaho Continuing Education agency is under the Idaho State Board of Education. In Michigan and Illinois, the organization is a subcommittee of the Council of Presidents of the state-supported universities. The Indiana Regional Campus Coordinating Committee was created out of an agreement among the boards of trustees of the four member institutions and is responsible to the Trustees Joint Policy Council for Regional Campuses. Iowa's State Extension Council is a cooperating committee made up of representatives from the Regents' institutions which reports to a committee of the three institutions' vice presidents. The state-supported institutions in Kansas cooperate through an Extension Commission composed of the chief administrative officers, which is responsible to the Board of Regents. Reporting to the Commission are state-wide directors of Academic, Industrial, and Agricultural Extension. The only contact between public and private institutions, however, is through the Kansas Association of Colleges and Universities. This year, the State of Virginia, through the State Council of Higher Education, established policies for the coordination of extension offerings of state-controlled institutions. No mention is made of guidelines for cooperation between public and private institutions of higher education and the organization membership is made up of state-supported colleges and universities. Washington has as its cooperating group the Inter-Institutional Committee on Continuing Education and Extension Activities with a membership of five state-supported institutions. A state-by-state summary of data for this group is provided in Appendix C.

There appears to be a trend toward expanding the scope of the organizations to include two-year and private colleges, as well as to include a greater variety of extension programs. Federal funds are also having an impact on organization activities. Title I of the Higher Education Act is a responsibility of three state organizations in Category 1 and, perhaps, of others which neglected to mention it.

There may also be some motivation to create permanently-staffed operations similar to those in Florida and Idaho and the one proposed for Michigan. It is not surprising to find that the more active these organizations become within the states, the greater the felt need to formalize and structure the operations.

Category 2: The Informal Organizations

Seven states coordinate extension offerings through loosely organized, informal associations. A summary of data for this group is presented in Table VIII. Mississippi and New Jersey include all or almost all of the institutions engaged in extension course work in their respective states within their cooperating organizations. The remaining five states have a

Table VIII

Make-Up of Organization Membership - By State - Category 2

N = 7

State	Total Memb.	Type of Institution		Type of Support		Frequency of Meetings
		Two Year	Four Year	Public	Private	
Louisiana	3	0	3	3(3)	0(0)	As needed
Mississippi	9	2	7	7(7)	2(2)	On call-approx. twice a year
Nebraska	Not given - - - - - -			(4)	(2)	Not given
New Jersey	21	4	17	11(13)	10(10)	Infrequently
Pennsylvania	5	0	5	2(8)	3(12)	3-6 times a yr.
South Carolina	3	0	3	3(3)	0(0)	Not given
Tennessee	Not given - - - - - -			(7)	(3)	Not given

comparatively small number of institutions involved. With the appointment of a State Coordinating Board, however, Tennessee may soon move into formal organization. All seven states indicate that meetings are infrequent and irregular.

In comparison with Category I organizations, the informal groups engage in fewer coordinating activities and plan for very little expansion of services and projects in the future. (Tables IX and X) Four states operate joint extension centers and accept each other's courses for equivalent credit. Of the remaining five activities listed in the questionnaire, none were engaged in by the majority of states reporting. (Table IX)

Table IX

Activities Conducted by Informal Organizations

N = 7 states

Activities	N
a. Collect and disseminate information relative to extension offerings	2
b. Operate joint extension centers	4
c. Coordinate course offerings to avoid duplication	3
d. Cooperate to provide comprehensive course offerings throughout state	1
e. Accept for equivalent credit, courses taught by faculty from member (cooperating) institutions	4
f. Maintain a file on qualified extension lecturers from which member institutions can draw	0
g. Work with other educational institutions and agencies to develop, coordinate, and strengthen extension programs	1

Table X

Activities Planned for Future Initiation

Louisiana	None
Mississippi	None
Nebraska	None
New Jersey	None
Pennsylvania	1) Attempting to provide an evening degree program
South Carolina	None
Tennessee	1) A State Coordinating Board for all public higher education institutions has just recently been appointed but has not met yet.

Programs connected with Title I appear to have encouraged inter-institutional cooperation in three of the seven states. (Table XI)

Table XI

Additional Activities Now in Operation

Louisiana	None
Mississippi	1) Cooperate on correspondence examination centers 2) Cooperate on Title I programs
Nebraska	1) Cooperate on Title I programs
New Jersey	None
Pennsylvania	1) A Curriculum Committee composed of representatives from the five institutions plans annual (extension) program and all revised offerings 2) Formation of the University Center of Harrisburg, Incorporated
South Carolina	None
Tennessee	1) Coordination of some Title I programs

A unique educational service growing out of the cooperative effort of five Pennsylvania institutions of higher education is the Harrisburg Area Center for Higher Education. Courses are selected from the catalogs of the five cooperating institutions and the teaching staff is provided from their regular faculty members. The Center provides graduate, undergraduate and informal courses and credits earned are transferable to any of the cooperating institutions. The Board of Directors and Executive Committee for the Center include community representatives as well as institutional representatives.

Category 5: No Organization--But a Need for Coordination

Two states were classified in this category, Maryland and Minnesota. It may be most effective to allow the respondents to speak for themselves.

> From Maryland--"Until a few years ago, almost the entire burden of providing continuing education or extension programs fell upon the University of Maryland. More recently, three of the state colleges (formerly teacher's colleges) have inaugurated evening programs and extension programs which are primarily for teachers. Some of the community colleges, and there are now twelve in the State of Maryland, have evening programs on their campuses. I do not believe that they offer any work off campus, and I assume that such programs would not fall under the title of extension for purposes of your study.

"The State of Maryland now has an Advisory Council for Higher Education, but it is only advisory in nature. The Council is undertaking various studies, and the question of extension or continuing education will be reviewed. Very recently, they have asked for information relative to Title I programs that are being conducted throughout the State of Maryland.

"Actually, Title I in Maryland has helped to bring together many of the different institutions. We have held three State-wide conferences and have had rather good support from the private and public institutions. Several programs have been funded under Title I that involve two or more institutions.

"In our area, we have still another complicating situation, and this is related to the extension programs conducted by the George Washington and American University. Both are located in Washington, D.C., approximately ten miles from our campus. In order to have some dialogue with the Washington, D.C., institutions, governmental agencies and other adult educational establishments, we have an informal area Round Table luncheon, generally once a month.

"We think it would be highly desirable to have greater cooperation and liaison not only within the State of Maryland, but also within the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. I am sure this will come about within the next few years, and we hope to play an active role in this development."

From Minnesota--"There are fourteen junior colleges in the state, ten of which offered evening classes during 1966-67. The number of courses ranged from two to a maximum of eleven. There are five state colleges all of which offered some on-campus and area off-campus courses in the evening. These programs were more substantial than those in the junior colleges, but the total number of registrations and courses in the five state colleges is approximately one-fourth as large as the University program..... No organization for or history of coordination exists among the institutions."

What, if any, role can the NASU-LGC Council on Extension play in assisting the states which are at this point in their growth to initiate coordination activities?

Category 6: Conflicting and Contradictory Information

As indicated in Table III, Arizona and Ohio each had more than one institution reporting and the data presented a confusing picture of the coordinating activities and the state organizations.

Apparently, in Arizona, there are at least three and possibly five state-supported institutions offering extension course work, no private institutions so engaged, and as many as six junior colleges doing something in extension. There does not appear to be any organization, formal or informal, which attempts to coordinate the extension work of the four-year institutions, but three of the junior colleges are cooperating in some kind of a formal arrangement.

Three Ohio institutions returned questionnaires. Between 8 and 11 state-supported and 8 and 41 private institutions offer extension course work in Ohio, depending on the report. There is disagreement about the existence of a formal coordinating organization; one respondent said there is such an organization and two said there is not. It is probably safe to conclude that little is done in the State of Ohio with regard to coordination of extension courses. Whether or not there is a need for coordination is not clear.

APPENDIX A

Committee on Relationships with Other Educational Institutions

NASU-LGC - COUNCIL ON EXTENSION

Please return Questionnaire to Committee Chairman: A. L. Hunter
Kellogg Center
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Name of Institution_____ Name of Respondent_____

SECTION I

1. How many institutions of higher education in the state (two-year and four-year, public and private) offer college or university extension course work (either credit or non-credit)? ____

   a. number of state supported institutions _____
   b. number of privately supported institutions _____
   c. number of other publicly supported institutions _____

2. Do some or all of these institutions belong to a formal organization which is concerned with coordinating extension offerings?

   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   IF YOU CHECKED "NO" ABOVE, DO NOT ANSWER ANY MORE QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION; SKIP TO SECTION II BELOW.

3. If your answer to "2" above was YES, is your institution a member of this organization?

   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   IF YOU CHECKED "NO" ABOVE, SKIP TO SECTION III.

4. If your answer to "3" above was YES, who is your institution's representative?

   NAME_____ TITLE_____

5. Please list member institutions and indicate type of support.

NAME OF INSTITUTION	TWO YEAR	FOUR YEAR	TYPE OF SUPPORT STATE	PRIVATE	OTHER PUBLIC

6. How often does the organization meet?_____

7. How are organization activities financed?_____

8. Which of the following activities do member institutions engage in?

_____a. collect and disseminate information relative to extension offerings of member institutions
_____b. operate joint extension centers
_____c. coordinate course offerings to avoid duplication
_____d. cooperate to provide comprehensive course offerings throughout the state
_____e. accept for equivalent credit, courses taught by faculty from other member institutions
_____f. maintain a file on qualified extension lecturers from which member institutions can draw for extension courses
_____g. work with other educational institutions and agencies to develop, coordinate, and strengthen extension programs

IF THERE ARE OTHER ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES CONCERNED WITH EXTENSION PROGRAMS NOT LISTED ABOVE, PLEASE LIST THEM HERE.

9. What, if any, plans does the organization have for expanding its activities in the future?_____

IF THERE ARE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE ABOUT THE OPERATION, RESPONSIBILITIES, EFFECTIVENESS, AND/OR WEAKNESSES OF THE ORGANIZATION, PLEASE DO SO ON THE REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE...AND...IF YOU HAVE AN INFORMATION SHEET DESCRIBING THE ORGANIZATION, PLEASE ATTACH IT TO THE SURVEY FORM.

SECTION II (Do not complete Sections II or III if you completed Section I)

3. Do the institutions of higher education in the state which offer college or university extension course work do anything to coordinate extension offerings?

_____Yes
_____No

If "NO", why not?_____

If "YES", would you briefly explain how coordination is accomplished?_____

4. Does your institution participate in the informal program you have just described?

_____Yes
_____No

If "NO", why not?_____

If "YES", PLEASE GO TO SECTION I AND COMPLETE QUESTIONS 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

SECTION III (Do not complete Section III if you completed Sections I or II)

3. Do you receive any services from the organization even though you are not a member?

_____Yes
_____No

If "YES", what are they?_____

4. Are you planning to become a member of the organization?

_____Yes
_____No

If "NO", why not?_____

APPENDIX B

Council on Extension
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

Institution	Official Contacted	Respondent
University of Alabama	Dean J. R. Morton	None
University of Alaska	Dean Arthur S. Buswell	Same
University of Arizona	Asst. Dean Samuel Britt	L. L. Darcy
Arizona State University	Dean Roy C. Rice	Same
University of Arkansas	Director Guy W. Berry	None
University of California	Dean Paul H. Sheats	None
University of Colorado	Dean D. Mack Easton	None
University of Connecticut	Dean Robert B. Norris	None
Cornell University	Asst. Dean R. F. Risley	None
University of Delaware	Director John A. Murray	Same
Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University	Director E. F. Norwood	None
State University System of Florida	Director Glenn A. Goerke	Same
University System of Georgia	Director H. B. Masters	None
Georgia Institute of Technology	Director L. V. Johnson	None
University of Hawaii	Asst. Dean W. D. Lamford	None
Idaho Continuing Education	Director L. Lee Woods	Same
University of Illinois	Dean Stanley C. Robinson	Same
Indiana University	Dean Smith Higgins	Same
State University of Iowa	Dean Robert F. Ray	Same
Iowa State University	Director George R. Town	None
University of Kansas	Director Howard Walker	None
Kansas State University	Dr. John E. Kitchens	Same
Kent State University	Dean William M. Stephens	N. A. Sicuro
University of Kentucky	Dean R. D. Johnson	None
Lincoln University	Director C. C. Damel	None
Louisiana State University	Director L. O. Pellegrin	James Sylvest
University of Maine	Director W. C. Libby	John M. Blake
University of Maryland	Assoc. Dean S. J. Drazek	Same
Miami University	Dean Earl V. Thesken	Same
University of Michigan	Director Everett J. Soop	None
Michigan State University	Director Armand L. Hunter	Same
University of Minnesota	Dean Willard L. Thompson	Same
University of Mississippi	Director Maurice H. Inman	None

Institution	Official Contacted	Respondent
Mississippi State University	Dean Homer S. Coskrey	Same
University of Missouri	Dean C. Brice Ratchford	Same
Montana State College	Director Robert C. McCall	None
Montana State University	Director Troy E. Crowder	None
University of Nebraska	Dean E. W. Janike	Same
University of Nevada	Dean J. Patrick Kelly	Roland J. Dick
University of New Hampshire	Director J. J. Petroski	Joe Shulda
University of New Mexico	Director Harold O. Ried	John D. Giesler
University of North Carolina	Director Charles F. Milner	Same
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State Univ.	Director F. A. Williams	Same
University of North Dakota	Dean Ben G. Gustafson	Same
North Dakota State University	Director T. W. Thordarson	None
Ohio University	Director Elizabeth Stanton	None
Ohio State University	Vice President J. T. Mount	Robert McCormick
University of Oklahoma	Dean Thurman J. White	Howell McGee
Oklahoma State University	Director J. C. Fitzgerald	Same (Received too late for inclusion in study)
Oregon State System of Higher Education	Vice Chancellor J. Sherburne	None
Pennsylvania State University	Director Floyd B. Fisher	Same
Prairie View Agricultural & Mechanical College	Director J. L. Brown	None
Purdue University	Dean C. H. Lawshe	F. K. Burrin
University of Rhode Island	Dean John R. Hackett	None
Rutgers--The State University	Assoc. Dean M. E. Weidner	Ernest E. McMahon
University of South Carolina	Director N. P. Mitchell	Same
State Univ. of South Dakota	Director R. D. Falk	None
Southern Illinois University	Dean Raymond H. Dey	None
Southern Univ. & Agricultural & Mechanical College	Director W. W. Clem	None
University of Tennessee	Dean J. E. Arnold	Same
University of Texas	Dean James R. D. Eddy	Same
University of Utah	Dean Brigham D. Madsen	J. L. Traver
Utah State University	Director Lloyd Drury	None
University of Vermont	Director R. V. Phillips	None
University of Virginia	Dean James W. Cole	None
Virginia State College	Director Samuel A. Madden	Same
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	Director Stuart B. Row	Roger L. Smith

Institution	Official Contacted	Respondent
University of Washington	Dean Lloyd W. Schram	Same
Washington State University	Director Norman A. Braden	None
Wayne State University	Dean Harlan L. Hagman	Hamilton Stillwell
West Virginia University	Dean Roman J. Verhaalen	K. E. Glancy
University of Wisconsin	Chancellor Donald McNeil	None
University of Wyoming	Director John W. Gates	Jim Andersen

APPENDIX C

Category I: The Formal Organizations

FLORIDA
Reporting: Glenn A. Goerke, State Director, Office for Continuing Education

Member Institutions

Name of Institution	Two Year	Four Year	Type of Support: State	Type of Support: Private	Activities: a	b	c	d	e	f	g	+	0
					x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
1. Univ. of Florida		x	x										
2. Florida State Univ.		x	x										
3. Univ. of South Florida		x	x										
4. Univ. of West Florida (Jr.-Sr.)	x		x										
5. Florida Atlantic Univ. (Jr.-Sr.)	x		x										
6. Florida A & M Univ.		x	x										
7. Florida Technological Univ.		x	x										

Meetings: Monthly
Financing: Through institutional budgets

IDAHO
Reporting: L. Lee Woods, Director, Idaho Continuing Education

Member Institutions

Name of Institution	Two Year	Four Year	Type of Support: State	Type of Support: Private	Activities: a	b	c	d	e	f	g	+	0
								x					
1. Univ. of Idaho		x	x										
2. Idaho State Univ.		x	x										

Meetings: Full-time staff
Financing: State support; income from fees

ILLINOIS

Reporting: S. C. Robinson, Dean, Division of University Extension, University of Illinois

Member Institutions

Name of Institution	Two Year	Four Year	Type of Support: State	Type of Support: Private	Activities: a	b	c	d	e	f	g	+ 3
					x	x	x	x	x		x	
1. Univ. of Illinois		x	x									
2. Northern Illinois Univ.		x	x									
3. Eastern Illinois Univ.		x	x									
4. Western Illinois Univ.		x	x									
5. Illinois State Univ. (Normal)		x	x									
6. Southern Illinois Univ.		x	x									
7. Illinois Teachers College Chicago (S)		x	x									
8. Illinois Teachers College, Chicago (N)		x	x									

Meetings: Quarterly

Financing: Institutions share costs as required

INDIANA

Reporting: F. K. Burrin, Purdue University, title not given
Smith Higgins, Dean, Division of University Extension, I.U.

Member Institutions

Name of Institution	Two Year	Four Year	Type of Support: State	Type of Support: Private	Activities: a	b	c	d	e	f	g	+ 1
					x	x	x	x	x		x	
1. Purdue Univ.		x	x									
2. Indiana Univ.		x	x									
3. Ball State Univ.		x	x									
4. Indiana State Univ.		x	x									

Meetings: Monthly

Financing: Institutions pro-rate share

IOWA

Reporting: Robert F. Ray, Dean, Division of Extension and University Services, University of Iowa

Member Institutions

Name of Institution	Two Year	Four Year	Type of Support: State	Type of Support: Private	Activities: a	b	c	d	e	f	g	+ 3
					x		x	x	x		x	
1. Univ. of Iowa		x	x									
2. Iowa State Univ.		x	x									
3. State College of Iowa		x	x									

Meetings: Monthly

Financing: Each institution pays share

KANSAS

Reporting: John E. Kitchens, Director, Division of Continuing Education, Kansas State University.

Member Institutions

Note: Coordination of activities for Kansas State University, the University of Kansas, and Kansas State Teachers College is accomplished through an Extension Commission composed of the chief executive officers of the three institutions. Coordination of activities for the three above-named institutions and Kansas State College of Pittsburg, Ft. Hays Kansas State College (both state supported) and Washburn University (a private institution) appears to be through the Kansas Association of Colleges and Universities, which has a membership of more than 50 institutions. No membership list was provided.

MICHIGAN

Reporting: Armand L. Hunter, Director, The Continuing Education Service, Michigan State University
Hamilton Stillwell, Dean, Division of Urban Extension, Wayne State University

Member Institutions

Name of Institution	Two Year	Four Year	Type of Support: State	Type of Support: Private	Activities a	b	c	d	e	f	g	+ 3
					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
1. Central Michigan Univ.		x	x									
2. Eastern Michigan Univ.		x	x									
3. Ferris State College		x	x									
4. Grand Valley State College		x	x									
5. Michigan State Univ.		x	x									
6. Michigan Technological Univ.		x	x									
7. Northern Michigan Univ.		x	x									
8. Univ. of Michigan		x	x									
9. Wayne State Univ.		x	x									
10. Western Michigan Univ.		x	x									
11. Saginaw Valley State College		x	x									

Meetings: 4-10 times yearly

Financing: Each institution pays own costs

NORTH CAROLINA

Reporting: F. A. Williams, Director, Extension Services, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State Universities
Charles F. Milner, Director, Extension Division, University of North Carolina

Member Institutions

Name of Institution	Two Year	Four Year	Type of Support: State	Type of Support: Private	Activities: a	b	c	d	e	f	g	+	0
						x	x				x		
1. Agricultural and Technical State University[a]		x	x										
2. Appalachian State College[a]		x	x										
3. East Carolina State Univ.[a]		x	x										
4. North Carolina College--Durham		x	x										
5. North Carolina State University[a]--Raleigh		x	x										
6. Univ. of North Carolina --Chapel Hill		x	x										
7. Univ. of North Carolina --Charlotte[b]		x	x										
8. Univ. of North Carolina --Greensboro		x	x										
9. West Carolina State Univ.[a]		x	x										

Meetings: Quarterly

Financing: Individual university contributions

a = Disagreement on institutional names

b = Not listed by Milner

NORTH DAKOTA

Reporting: Ben G. Gustafson, Dean, Extension Division, University of North Dakota

Member Institutions

Name of Institution	Two Year	Four Year	Type of Support: State	Type of Support: Private	Activities: a	b	c	d	e	f	g	+
					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	l
1. Univ. of North Dakota		x	x									
2. North Dakota State Univ.		x	x									
3. Minot State College		x	x									
4. Mayville State College		x	x									
5. Valley City State College		x	x									
6. Dickinson State College		x	x									
7. Jamestown College		x		x								
8. Mary's College		x		x								
9. North Dakota State School of Forestry	x		x									
10. North Dakota State School of Science	x		x									
11. Bismarck Junior College	x		x									
12. Lake Region State College	x		x									
13. Richardton State College	x			x								

Meetings: Monthly

Financing: By member schools

OKLAHOMA

Reporting: Howell McGee, University of Oklahoma, no title given

Member Institutions

Name of Institution	Two Year	Four Year	Type of Support: State	Type of Support: Private	Activities: a x	b	c x	d	e x	f	g x	+ 0
1. Central State College		x	x									
2. East Central State College		x	x									
3. Langston University		x	x									
4. Northeastern State College		x	x									
5. Northwestern State College		x	x									
6. Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts		x	x									
7. Oklahoma State University		x	x									
8. Panhandle A & M College		x	x									
9. Southeastern State College		x	x									
10. Southwestern State College		x	x									
11. University of Oklahoma		x	x									
12. Cameron State Agric. College	x		x									
13. Connors State Agric. College	x		x									
14. Eastern Oklahoma A & M College	x		x									
15. Murray State Agric. College	x		x									
16. Northeastern Oklahoma A & M	x		x									
17. Northern Oklahoma Jr. College	x		x									
18. Oklahoma Military Academy	x		x									
19. Bethany Nazarene College		x		x								
20. Oklahoma Baptist University		x		x								
21. Oklahoma City University		x		x								
22. Phillips University		x		x								
23. University of Tulsa		x		x								
24. Altus Jr. College	x		Not given									
25. El Reno Jr. College	x		Not given									
26. Poteau Community College	x		Not given									

Meetings: Monthly

Financing: Through State Regents for Higher Education

UTAH

Reporting: J. L. Traver, University of Utah, no title given

Member Institutions

Name of Institution	Two Year	Four Year	Type of Support: State	Type of Support: Private	Activities: a	b	c	d	e	f	g	+
					x		x	x	x		x	0
1. University of Utah		x	x									
2. Weber State College		x	x									
3. Utah State University		x	x									
4. Brigham Young University		x		x								

Meetings: Monthly

Financing: State and Federal funds

VIRGINIA

Reporting: Roger L. Smith, Director, Extension Division, Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Samuel A. Madden, Director, Division of Field Services, Virginia State College

Member Institutions

Name of Institution	Two Year	Four Year	Type of Support: State	Type of Support: Private	Activities: a	b	c	d	e	f	g	+
					x	x	x	x	a	a	a	1
1. Mary Washington College		x	x									
2. Medical College of Virginia		x	x									
3. Radford College		x	x									
4. Longwood College		x	x									
5. University of Virginia		x	x									
6. Virginia State College--Norfolk		x	x									
7. Virginia Military Institute		x	x									
8. College of William & Mary		x	x									
9. Virginia State College --Petersburg		x	x									
10. Richmond Professional Inst.		x	x									
11. Old Dominion College		x	x									
12. Virginia Polytechnic Inst.		x	x									
13. Madison College		x	x									
14. Northern Virginia Comm. Coll.	x		x									

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAR 26 1969
on Adult Education

Meetings: 5-8 times yearly

Financing: By member institutions and State Council of Higher Education

a = Disagreement on these activities